

Appl. No. 10/699,277  
Docket No. 8473MR2L  
Response Dated April 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed on March 16, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

**REMARKS**

**Response to Restriction Requirement**

The Examiner has required, under 35 USC §121, election of a single group of claims for prosecution on the merits. A provisional election is made herein with traverse.

**Traversal of Restriction Requirement**

The Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement as it is considered improperly made. The Examiner states that Group I (Claims 1-9) is directed to a composition comprising a non-digestible, non-absorbable, open-celled polymeric foam, and that Group II (Claims 10-22) is directed to a method sequestering lipophilic material present in the gastrointestinal tract of an animal comprising administration of a composition comprising a non-digestible, non-absorbable, open-celled polymeric foam to the animal.

The Examiner states that the two groups are related as product and process of use, but that the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another, materially different product and the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process.

The Applicants assert, however, that the compositions and methods defined by Groups I and II have the same goal and effects, to provide a non-digestible polymeric foam to sequester ingested materials, and the Applicants therefore believe a search could be coextensive. Therefore, the Restriction Requirement should be withdrawn.

However, in compliance with the Restriction Requirement, the Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 1-9, drawn to the composition. As the Examiner has noted, Claims 23-28, directed to a kit, will also be examined with elected Group I.

The Applicants, however, note and acknowledge that upon the allowance of a composition claim, withdrawn method claims will be rejoined, in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04.

Appl. No. 10/699,277  
Docket No. 8473MR2L  
Response Dated April 2, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed on March 16, 2007  
Customer No. 27752

Conclusion

The Applicants therefore respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the Restriction Requirement and proceed to examination of the application on the merits. If the Examiner believes that personal contact would be beneficial for disposition of the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By   
Signature

Kristin Kohler  
Registration No. 41,907  
(513) 662-3371

Date: April 2, 2007  
Customer No. 27752